arXiv:1512.03508v1 [math.ST] 11 Dec 2015

# Unbiasedness and Bayes Estimation

Siamak Noorbaloochi*
HSR& D Center for Chronic Disease Outcomes Research
VA Health Care System
Department of Medicine
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
and
Glen Meeden
School of Statistics
University of Minnesota
School of Statistics
313 Ford Hall
224 Church ST S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0460

November, 2015

*Research was supported by IIR 12-340 HSR&D grant, Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Office of Research and Development, Health Services Research and Development

**Abstract**

Assuming squared error loss, we show that finding unbiased estimators and Bayes estimators can be treated as using a pair of linear operators that operate between two Hilbert spaces. We note that these integral operators are adjoint and then investigate some consequences of this fact.

Key Words: Unbiasedness, Bayes estimators, squared error loss and consistency

# 1 Introduction

Statistical inference is used to produce 'plausible' data-based assertions and rules about a partially unknown population. Two well-adopted and seemingly adverse inference plausibility criteria are unbiasedness and being Bayes. The task of the current note is to explore further the relationship between these two procedures by treating them as operators that represent our inference procedures.

Let $p_\theta(\cdot)$ be the density of $X$ for the parameter $\theta$. Let $\pi$ be the prior density for $\theta$, with the sample space being denoted by $\mathcal{X}$ and the parameter space by $\Theta$. Suppose $\gamma$, some real-valued function defined on $\Theta$, is to be estimated using $X$. A data-based rule $\delta$ is said to be mean unbiased for $\gamma$ if $E_\theta \delta(X) = \gamma(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Under squared error loss, for a given prior $\pi$ over $\Theta$, a rule $\delta_\pi$ is a Bayes rule (against squared error loss) for $\gamma$ if $E(\gamma(\theta)|x) = \delta_\pi(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Lehmann (1951) proposed a generalization of the above notion of unbiasedness which takes into account the loss function for the problem. Noorbaloochi and Meeden (1983) proposed a generalization of Lehmann's definition which depends, in addition, on a prior distribution $\pi$ for $\theta$.

In this note, restricting to squared error loss, corresponding to a given prior $\pi$, a Hilbert space of all square integrable real-valued functions of $X$ and $\theta$ is constructed. Given the induced inner products and norms we observe that unbiasedness and being Bayes are adjoint operators. From this fact we derive some orthogonality relationships between Bayes and unbiased estimators and the functions they are estimating.

# 2 Notation

We begin with some notation and the spaces that we will use to develop the discussion. Let

$$\mathcal{H}_\pi = \{h(x,\theta) : \int\int h^2(x,\theta) p_\theta(x) \pi(\theta) dx\, d\theta < \infty\}$$

be the space of all square-integrable real-valued functions of $(x, \theta)$. Note $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ becomes a Hilbert space when it is equipped with the inner product

$$(h_1, h_2) = \int\int h_1(x,\theta) h_2(x,\theta) p_\theta(x) \pi(\theta) dx\, d\theta$$

Let $\|h\|_\pi = \sqrt{(h,h)}$ denote the norm of $h$. We include the subscript $\pi$ to remind us that $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ does depend on $\pi$. We assume that $p_\theta(x)$ is in the above space.

There are two linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ which are of particular interest. The first is

$$\Gamma_\pi = \{\gamma(\theta) : \int \gamma^2(\theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta \ < \infty\}$$

and the second is

$$\Delta_m = \{\delta(x) : \int \delta^2(x)m(x)dx \ < \infty\}$$

where $m(x) = \int p_\theta(x)\pi(\theta)\, d\theta$.

The set $\Gamma_\pi$ is a Hilbert subspace of $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ with the induced weighted inner product $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)_\pi = \int_\Theta \gamma_1(\theta)\gamma_2(\theta)\pi(\theta)\, d\theta$. Similarly, $\Delta_m$ is a Hilbert subspace with the induced weighted inner product $(\delta_1, \delta_2)_m = \int_\mathcal{X} \delta_1(x)\delta_2(x)m(x)dx$. We also notice that, provided the interchange of order of integration is permitted, for any $\delta \in \Delta_m$ we have: $\mathrm{Var}_\theta\delta(X) < \infty$ and hence $E_\theta\delta(X) < \infty$ for all $\theta$ in the support of $\pi$. If the support of $\pi$ is all of $\Theta$, all members of $\Delta_m$ are unbiased estimators of their expectations and, for any $\delta \in \Delta_m$:

$$\int_\Theta E_\theta\delta(X)\pi(\theta)\, d\theta = E_m\delta(X) < \infty$$

implying that when $\pi(\theta) > 0$ for all $\theta$, the set of all estimable functions, which we will denote by $\Gamma_e$, is a subset of $\Gamma_\pi$.The assumed square-integrability of the likelihoods and the Holder inequality imply that for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$:

$$\int_\Theta \gamma(\theta)p_\theta(x)\pi(\theta)\, d\theta < \infty$$

and hence all have Bayes estimators. With the above notation, the Euclidian distance between any $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$ and $\delta \in \Delta_m$ is $\|\delta - \gamma\|_\pi^2 = r(\delta, \gamma; \pi)$, which is the Bayes risk associated with the pair.

Let us define the operator, $\mathcal{U}$

$$\mathcal{U} : \Delta_m \to \Gamma_\pi$$

as the *unbiasedness operator* if for a given $\gamma$, $\mathcal{U}\delta = \gamma$ if and only if

$$r(\delta, \gamma; \pi) = \inf_{\gamma' \in \Gamma_\pi} r(\delta, \gamma'; \pi)$$

For mean-unbiasedness, $\mathcal{U}$ can be defined through the integral transform:

$$\mathcal{U} : \Delta_m \to \Gamma_\pi \text{ if and only if } E_\theta(\delta(X)) = \gamma(\theta) \text{ for all } \theta$$

Hence in this case, the operator $\mathcal{U}$ is a linear operator.

Similarly, the Bayes operator: $\mathcal{B}_\pi$ may be defined as:

$$\mathcal{B}_\pi : \Gamma_\pi \to \Delta_m$$

where for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$, $\mathcal{B}_\pi \gamma = \delta_\pi$ if and only if

$$r(\delta_\pi, \gamma; \pi) = \inf_{\delta' \in \Delta_m} r(\delta', \gamma; \pi)$$

For squared error loss, the Bayes operator corresponds to the linear operator:

$$\mathcal{B}_\pi : \Gamma_\pi \to \Delta_m \text{ if and only if } E(\gamma(\theta)|x) = \delta(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}$$

We are now ready to state the main observation of the manuscript. Throughout we always assume that we are dealing with a fixed prior $\pi$.

# 3 The relationship between unbiasedness and being Bayes

Given the above setup we now show that the Bayes and unbiasedness operators, $\mathcal{B}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are the adjoint operators of each other. That is, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$ and any $\delta \in \Delta_m$ we have

$$(\gamma, \mathcal{U}\delta)_\pi = (\mathcal{B}_\pi \gamma, \delta)_m \tag{1}$$

The proof is easy, i.e,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma, \mathcal{U}\delta)_\pi &= \int_\Theta \gamma(\theta) E_\theta \delta(X) \pi(\theta)\, d\theta = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \delta(x) [\int_\Theta \gamma(\theta) f_\theta(x) \pi(\theta)\, d\,\theta] dx \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \delta(x) [\int_\Theta \gamma(\theta) \frac{f_\theta(x)\pi(\theta)}{m(x)}\, d\theta] m(x) dx = (\delta, E(\gamma(\theta) \mid x))_m \\
&= (\delta, \mathcal{B}_\pi \gamma)_m
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the unbiased operator is independent of the chosen prior and $\mathcal{U}$ simultaneously is the adjoint of all $\mathcal{B}_\pi$ for *all* priors with $\Theta$ support.

We denote the range of $\mathcal{U}$ by $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$. This is the set of all functions in $\Gamma_\pi$ which have an unbiased estimator. We denote the range of $\mathcal{B}_\pi$ by $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$. This is the set of all Bayes estimators (with respect to squared error loss) in $\Delta_m$. In addition we have the null spaces of these two operators. $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U})$ is the set of all unbiased estimators of zero. If the model is complete this will contain just one function. $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$ is the set of all functions with zero as their Bayes estimator. It is a basic result of functional analysis (see Rudin (1991)) that from equation 1 we can write

$$\Gamma_\pi = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}) \bigoplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi) \tag{2}$$

$$\Delta_m = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}_\pi) \bigoplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U}) \tag{3}$$

The first equation implies that every member of $\Gamma_\pi$ can be orthogonally decomposed into a function with an unbiased estimator plus a function whose Bayes estimator is zero and the second equation implies that every member of $\Delta_m$ can be orthogonally decomposed into a Bayes estimator (of some $\gamma$) plus an unbiased estimator of zero and both these decompositions are unique. As far as we know this has never been noted before and shows that the notions of being unbiased and being Bayes are more closely entwined than previously thought.

The first equation shows that given any $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$ there exist a unique $\gamma_e \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$ and a unique $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$ such that

$$\gamma(\theta) = \gamma_e(\theta) + \alpha(\theta) \quad \text{for } \theta \in \Theta$$

So every function will have an unbiased estimator if and only if the only function whose Bayes estimator is the zero function is zero function. Furthermore when $\alpha$ is not the trivial function we see that the Bayes estimator of $\gamma$ must also be the Bayes estimator of $\gamma_e$.

The second equation shows that given $\delta \in \Delta_m$ there exists a unique $\delta_\pi \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$ and a unique $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U})$ such that

$$\delta(x) = \delta_\pi(x) + \delta_0(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{X}$$

So every decision function will be a Bayes estimator for some $\gamma$ if and only if the only unbiased estimator of the zero function is the zero function. Also, the orthogonal decompositions imply that

$$\|\delta\|_m^2 = \|\delta_\pi\|_m^2 + \|\delta_0\|_m^2 \tag{4}$$

$$\|\gamma\|_\pi^2 = \|\gamma_e\|_\pi^2 + \|\alpha\|_\pi^2 \tag{5}$$

# 4 Some Consequences

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$ is a proper subset of $\Gamma_\pi$. Let $\delta \in \Delta_m$ be the Bayes estimator for some function $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$ which does not belong to $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$. Then there exists a unique $\gamma_e \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$ and an unique $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$ such that $\delta$ is the Bayes estimator of $\gamma_e$. In addition, the Bayes risk of $\delta$ when estimating $\gamma_e$ is strictly less than its Bayes risk when estimating $\gamma$.*

*Proof.* For a given $\gamma$, by equation 2 it can be written as

$$\gamma = \gamma_e + \alpha$$

where $\gamma_e \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$. Then for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\gamma(\theta)|x) &= E(\gamma_e(\theta)|x) + E(\alpha(\theta|x) \\ &= E(\gamma_e(\theta)|x) \end{aligned}$$

since $E(\alpha(\theta)|x) = 0$. We note that the decomposition in equation 2 is prior-dependent. Indeed, $\gamma_e$ is the projection of $\gamma$ into $\Gamma_e$, that is:

$$\|\gamma(\theta) - \gamma_e(\theta)\|_\pi = min_{\gamma'_e \in \Gamma_e} \|\gamma(\theta) - \gamma'_e(\theta)\|_\pi$$

To prove the second part we note that

$$\|\delta_\pi - \gamma\|_\pi^2 = \|\delta_\pi - \gamma_e\|_\pi^2 + \|\alpha_0\|_\pi^2 - 2(\delta_\pi - \gamma_e, \alpha_0)_\pi$$

but $E_\pi(\gamma_e \alpha_0) = 0$ by orthogonality of $\gamma_e$ and $\alpha_0$, and

$$E_\pi E_\theta(\delta_\pi(X)\alpha_0(\theta)) = E_m(\delta_\pi(X)E(\alpha_0(\theta)|X)) = 0$$

since $\alpha_0(\theta) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$. Therefore,

$$\|\delta_\pi - \gamma\|_\pi^2 = \|\delta_\pi - \gamma_e\|_\pi^2 + \|\alpha_0\|_\pi^2$$

□

**Theorem 2.** *Let $\gamma$ be a member of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$ and let $\delta$ be its Bayes estimator. Let $\lambda(\theta) = E_\theta \delta(X)$ and $b(\theta) = \gamma(\theta) - \lambda(\theta)$, the bias of $\delta$ as an estimator of $\gamma$. Then the Bayes risk of $\delta$ as an estimator of $\gamma$ is $(b, \gamma)_\pi$.*

*Proof.* The Bayes risk of the Bayes rule $\delta_\pi$ for estimating $\gamma$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} r(\delta_\pi, \gamma) &= E_\pi E_\theta(\delta(X) - \gamma(\theta))^2 \\ &= E_m \delta_\pi^2(X) + E_\pi \gamma^2(\theta) - E_\pi E_\theta(\delta_\pi(X)\gamma(\theta)) - E_\pi E_\theta(\delta_\pi(X)\gamma(\theta)) \end{aligned}$$

but

$$E_\pi E_\theta(\delta_\pi(X)\gamma(\theta)) = E_m(\delta_\pi(X)E(\gamma(\theta)|X)) = E_m\delta_\pi^2(X)$$

and similarly conditioning on $\theta$

$$E_\pi E_\theta(\delta_\pi(X)\gamma(\theta)) = E_\pi(\gamma(\theta)E(\delta_\pi(X)|\theta)) = E_\pi(\gamma(\theta)\lambda(\theta))$$

Substituting these into the previous equation and simplifying we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\delta_\pi, \gamma) &= E_\pi \gamma^2(\theta) - E_\pi(\gamma(\theta)\lambda(\theta)) \\ &= E_\pi \gamma^2(\theta) + E_\pi(\gamma(\theta)(b(\theta) - \gamma(\theta))) \\ &= E_\pi \gamma(\theta) b(\theta) \\ &= (b, \gamma)_\pi \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that an immediate corollary is the well known fact that if an estimator is both unbiased and Bayes for some $\gamma$ then its Bayes risk is zero.

Given a model, a prior and a function to be estimated, the Bayes risk of the Bayes rule is a measure of the informativeness of our inferences. The smaller the size of the Bayes risk the more informative is our "best" estimator about the function being estimated. If this minimum is large then the Bayes estimator is not very informative. (For further discussion on this point see see Raiffa and Schlaiffer(1962), DeGroot(1962,1984) and Ginebra(2007)). The previous theorem quantifies the relationship between the Bayes risk and bias and shows that there will only be a "good" Bayes estimator when its bias is small.

Therefore, in order to reduce the minimum Bayes risk of the Bayes estimator of the function being estimated, one has to reduce the bias of the Bayes rule. This can be achieved by increasing the sample size, as the following argument shows. For the rest of this note we assume that given $\theta$, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent and identically distributed random variables. Furthermore $\|h\|_{\pi,n}^2$ will denote the norm for the $n$ fold problem.

**Theorem 3.** *For a sample of size one let $U \in \Delta_{\pi,1}$ be an unbiased estimator of $\gamma \in \Gamma_\pi$ and $U_n = \sum_{i=1}^n U(X_i)/n$. Let $\delta_{\pi,n}$ be the Bayes estimator of $\gamma$ based on the sample of size $n$. If $\|U_n - \gamma\|^2_{\pi,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ then*

*i.* $\|\delta_{\pi,n} - \gamma\|^2_{\pi,n} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$

*ii.* $\|U_n - \delta_{\pi,n}\|^2_{\pi,n} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$

*Proof.* Let $\tau$ be the Bayes risk of $U$ for estimating $\gamma$ when $n = 1$. Then the Bayes risk of $U_n$ is just $\tau/n$. But the Bayes risk for $\delta_{\pi,n}$ for estimating $\gamma$ is no greater than the Bayes risk of $U_n$ so part $i$ follows.

It is easy to see that

$$\|U_n - \gamma\|^2_{\pi,n} = \|U - \delta_{\pi,n}\|^2_{\pi,n} + \|\delta_{\pi,n} - \gamma\|^2_{\pi,n}$$

by adding and subtracting $\delta_{\pi,n}$ inside the lefthand side and then multiplying out and observing that the cross product term is zero by conditioning on the data. Now part $ii$ follows from part $i$ and the above equation because both of the terms involving $\gamma$ go to zero as $n \to \infty$.

□

The second part of the theorem implies for large $n$ that a Bayesian whose prior is $\pi$ believes with high probability that their estimator will be close to the unbiased estimator. Note another Bayesian with a different prior believes the same thing. So they both expect agreement as the sample size increases. This result is somewhat in the spirit of one in Blackwell and Dubins (1962).

It is well know that Bayes estimators are usually consistent and tend to agree as the sample size increases. Most of the standard arguments for the consistency of Bayes estimators start with considering the asymptotic distribution of the posterior distribution, see for example Johnson (1970). These arguments are closely related to the asymptotic behavior of the maximum likelihood estimator and can be technically quite complex. For a discussion of this point and more references see O'Hagan (1994). Here however we tied the asymptotic behavior of the Bayes estimator to that of an unbiased estimator. The lack of assumptions and the relative simplicity of this argument comes at the cost of being unable to say anything directly about the asymptotic behavior of the posterior distribution. But it does underline the relationship between being Bayes and unbiasedness.

# 5 Two simple examples

In this section we consider two simple examples to demonstrate in more detail the relationships between the two concepts.

**Example 1.** Let $X$ be a random variable, with probability mass function in the family: $p_\theta(x) = \frac{1}{2}$, for $x = 1$, $= \frac{1-\theta}{4}$, for $x = 2$, and $= \frac{1+\theta}{4}$, for $x = 3$, with $0 < \theta \leq 1$. For the uniform prior, the posterior is: $\pi(\theta|x) = 1$, when $x = 1, = 2(1-\theta)$, for $x = 2$, and $= \frac{2(1+\theta)}{3}$, for $x = 3$, with $m(x) = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{3}{8}$, respectively, for $x = 1, 2$, and 3. For this example, $\Gamma_\pi = \{\gamma(\theta) : \int_0^1 \gamma^2(\theta)\, d\theta < \infty\}$ and $\Delta_m = \mathcal{R}^3$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{R}(U) = \{l(\theta) : l(\theta) = a + b\theta\ a, b \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(U) = \mathcal{Z} = \{(a, -a, -a) : a \in \mathcal{R}\}$. Letting $c = \int_0^1 \gamma(\theta)\, d\theta$ and $d = \int_0^1 \theta\gamma(\theta)\, d\theta$, we see that $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}_\pi) = \{(c, 2(c-d), \frac{2(c+d)}{3}) :\ c, d \in \mathcal{R}\}$. We also have that

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi) = \{\gamma(\theta) : \int_0^1 \gamma(\theta)\, d\theta = 0 \text{ and } \int_0^1 \theta\gamma(\theta)\, d\theta = 0\}$$

Note that $(\delta, z)_m = \sum_1^3 \delta_\pi(x) z(x) m(x) = \frac{1}{2}ac - \frac{2(ac-d)}{8} - \frac{3}{8}\frac{2(ac+d)}{3} = 0$ confirming the orthogonality of Bayes rules and unbiased estimators of zero. Also, for any $\gamma(\theta) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_\pi)$ and any $l(\theta) = a + b\theta \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U})$:

$$(\gamma, l)_\pi = \int_0^1 \gamma(\theta)(a + b\theta)\, d\theta = a\int_0^1 \gamma(\theta) + b\int_0^1 \theta\gamma(\theta) = 0$$

and thus confirming the orthogonality of functions which have an unbiased estimator and those whose Bayes estimate is zero.

**Example 2.** Let $X$ be a Bernoulli, with success probability $\theta$ and the prior is uniform over $(0, 1)$. The class of linear functions in $\theta$ is the subspace of estimable functions, $\Gamma_e$. The function $e^\theta$ does not have an unbiased estimator but its Bayes estimator is $E(e^\theta|x) = 2(e-2)$, when $x = 0$ and is $= 2$, when $x = 1$. However, projecting $e^\theta$ into this subspace using the least square procedure by solving:

$$\begin{cases} a_0 + a_1 E_\pi\theta = E_\pi e^\theta \\ a_0 E_\pi\theta + a_1 E_\pi\theta^2 = E_\pi\theta e^\theta, \end{cases}$$

yields the the function $\gamma_e(\theta) = (4e - 10) + (18 - 6e)\theta$. This function has the same Bayes estimator as $e^\theta$ and the Bayes estimator of the approximation

error, $(4e-9)+(17-6e)\theta+\sum_2^\infty \theta^k/k!$, is zero. However the same Bayes estimator of $e^\theta$ and $(4e-10)+(18-6e)\theta$ have different Bayes risks: $1/2(3e^2-16e+21)\approx 0.1626$ and $2e^2-12e+18\approx 0.1587$, respectively.

Suppose now we wish to estimate the function $1-\theta^2$. Its Bayes estimator, say $\delta^*$, estimates $5/6$ when $X=0$ and $1/2$ when $X=1$. It is easy to check that the only polynomials of degree 2 whose Bayes estimator is the zero function are of the form $a/6-a\theta+a\theta^2$ for some real number $a$. Hence the decomposition

$$1-\theta^2=(7/6-\theta)+(-1/6+\theta-\theta^2)$$

breaks it up into the sum of a function with an unbiased estimator and a function whose Bayes estimator is the zero function. So $\delta^*$ is also the Bayes estimator of the function $7/6-\theta$.

More generally, in the binomial case of size n, if we let, $P_0(\theta)=1$ and for $k=1,\ldots,n$ let $P_k(\theta)$ be orthonormal polynomials with respect to the inner product of $\Gamma_\pi$, which together forms a basis for the space of the functions which have unbiased estimators, then the Bayes estimator of any $\gamma\in\Gamma_\pi$ is

$$E(\gamma(\theta)|x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n}(\gamma,P_k)_\pi E(P_k(\theta)|x)=E_\pi\gamma(\theta)+\sum_{k=1}^{n}(\gamma,P_k)_\pi E(P_k(\theta)|x)$$

This shows that all the Bayes estimates belong to the linear space spanned by the Bayes estimates of this basis and moreover, $\gamma(\theta)-\sum_0^n(\gamma,P_k)_\pi P_k(\theta)$ has zero as its Bayes estimator. Note that the space of unbiasedly estimable functions is independent of the prior, but the projection of a given function $\gamma$ (without an unbiased estimator) into this subspace depends on the prior through the induced inner product.

# 6 Final remarks

We see from equation (2) that a function $\gamma$ has an unbiased estimator if and only if it is orthogonal to every function of the parameter which has the zero function as its Bayes estimator. From equation (3) we see that a function $\delta$ is a Bayes estimator of some $\gamma$ if and only if it is orthogonal to all unbiased estimators of the zero function.

This becomes clearer if we think about the situation where both $\Theta$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are finite. Let $K$ be the number of elements in $\Theta$ and $N$ be the number

of elements in $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\gamma$ has an unbiased estimator $\delta$ if

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}(\delta(x)-\gamma(\theta))p_\theta(x)=0 \quad \text{for } \theta\in\Theta \tag{6}$$

while $\delta$ is Bayes for $\gamma$ if

$$\sum_{\theta\in\Theta}(\delta(x)-\gamma(\theta))\pi(\theta|x)=0 \quad \text{for } x\in\mathcal{X} \tag{7}$$

These are two systems of linear equations. The first has $K$ equations in $N$ unknowns, the $\delta(x)$'s, while the second has $N$ equations in $K$ unknowns, the $\gamma(\theta)$'s. We may arrange the members of the statistical model into the $K\times N$ stochastic matrix having as its rows the $K$ probability mass functions, $P=(p_{\theta_i}(x_j))$. The collection of posteriors yield a $N$ by $K$ stochastic matrix $\Pi=(\pi(\theta_i|x_j))$. Here $\mathcal{U}$ is the matrix $P$ and $\Pi$ is $\mathcal{B}_\pi$. We notice that the two matrices, $P$ and $\Pi$, need not be square and hence necessarily are not projection matrices. It is the relationship between ranks of $P$ and $\Pi$ which determines the form of the four linear subspaces described above and results in the close relationship between being Bayes and being unbiased.

In this note we have seen that considering inference procedures as operators acting between the data and the parameter space can lead to new insights about the relationship between being Bayes and unbiasedness. This suggests that there could be other insights that arise from this perspective.